

**POLITICAL, AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC CHALLENGES IN TRANSFORMING  
INDONESIA TO BE A TWENTY FIRST CENTURY PROSPEROUS  
AND MODERN STATE**

**Oleh**

**Letkol Kal Dani Herdiana, M.M.  
Kasiadakesus Subdis Adasus Disadaau**



It must be at everyone's dream to live in a utopian country where its government can dutifully provide their people with the desirable standard of public services across the board that the people is supposed to get. Due to the best public welfare that the state could provide for the entire people, the economic inequality in that country could be somehow curtailed that the gap between the affluent and the destitute does not significantly exist. Everybody who are living in every corner of the country must be free from starvation, diseases, conflicts and any type of political oppression from their rulers. The majority of the people will happily and voluntarily participate in any election event the

country held to select the best leader they may get because they believe that the egalitarian political system the country has is credible enough for free and fair election to be held. The government of the country is providing its own people with a favorable environment to do businesses to its greatest possible extent to enable the people to get competitive and innovative enough so that they could capitalize on their inventions to a maximum extent for the sake of the people wealth and prosperity. There would be no fear amongst the people that their innovation, their genuine ideas and the benefits they could reap from them hopelessly stolen by their government or other powerful entities. The government of the country would guarantee that all the people would have equal opportunities to participate in the political and economic system regardless of whatever race, religion and gender the people has.

The people of such a country is living under a strong state with a good government system which is based on the rule of law. The laws that could be impartially and fairly applied to all society even to the most powerful entity or individual in that country. In such an ideal nation, all the people have a fair and equal treatment politically and socio-economically regardless of whatever race, religion and gender the people has. The deprivation of such rights to a particular group of people would be accordingly considered gross fundamental human right abuses.

There is a high trust between the government, political elites and all the society in the country, in which any significant political, economic or social differences that may arise among them could not increasingly lead to a severe social crisis, disunity and chaos. All the associated stakeholders of the country would consciously and voluntarily come to intercede once those differences likely to come up and try to solve them in a democratic, amicable and peaceful manner to achieve a collective goal acceptable to every member

of the society. Due to the fact that such a social trust has deeply taken root within that society, it would accordingly not take a lot of effort for the nation to build a law-abiding society across the board. The society that will consciously make integrity as their moral standard and strongly eschew the ones which totally contradict it. However, such a life that everybody dreamt of could be only manifested in a country with a strong centralized and highly functional government that is able to run its business in a well-organized and highly effective manner.

On the other hand, such a utopian dream will be highly unlikely to happen in a country with a poor and weak government in which corruption is deeply seated, patronage and clientelism practices widespread, the government officials lack of skills and education because most of them are politically appointed rather than appointed through merit based systems, -meritocracy seems just to be a bizarre word for the elites in such a country. The central government in such a country is too weak to uphold the rule of law to create orders in the society and they are also too poor to provide acceptable public services for all people. Due to the non-existent of strongly centralized government, the life in those weak countries with highly low trust societies, referring to Thomas Hobbes's book "Leviathan", might be so horrendously "solitary, poor, dirty, short and brutish" as though there is no need for the people there to wake up from their sleep tomorrow morning because they may find that the condition might stay the same. Those circumstances would most likely prohibit the country to experience inclusive growth in economy as well as improvement in some other essential areas such as national security, science & technology, infrastructure, education, social, politics and public welfare. How the country could get the best quality of human resource to run the state if the most productive, innovative and high integrity persons they possess leave that country, just trying to get good fortunes in other places where favorable environment to constructively develop their skills and innovation are provided.

This essay is aimed to discuss about the Indonesia arrival at the today political and economic development as well as the challenges that Indonesia faces in order to be able to transform the country into 21<sup>st</sup> democratic, modern and strong nation-state based on values enshrined in Pancasila, the five fundamental principles to guide the country to their dreams. Basically, the ideal foundation of the modern state as such must have been envisaged by all level of Indonesia society, even since the inception of Indonesia as a nation state which was officially declared in 1945. However, such a dream has been barely fulfilled to such extent since then. It goes without saying that, to a certain extent, the most likely prohibitive factors for Indonesian to reach their dream is due to the fact that Indonesia today is still mired and plagued by a number of chronic and deep seated socio-political issues, just to name a few, such as ongoing corruption which is happening in every level of the government institutions, widespread patrimonialism that still exists in today modern Indonesia political institutions, as well as the failure of the Indonesia government nationally and regionally in providing better public services due to its poor governance. Despite the fact that currently the Government of Indonesia has strenuously put forward a number of preventive and curative measures to address those issues, however they are not seemingly able to meet such expectations due to the complexity of the issues per se.

## **History of the Modern States Creation**

A state is a centralized political entity which has a legitimate power to rule a certain territory. In pre-historic era, a state could be similar to a group of family members residing in a certain territory whereby the only trusted persons they have are their own family members, because family was the only protector as well as the provider of their livelihood upon which they could depend. Typically, they only appoint their rulers from their family and friends. Never had they appointed an outsider to become their leader, because they needed to know better the ones with whom they hunt and fight. In such a primordial state, patronage seems to be a normal practice and could provide the people with an average socio-political equilibrium. The inclination of individual person to his/her family members is exactly one of the intrinsic traits of human behavior which is uneasily separable from human culture, and it even occurs every now and then in today political stage with various degree. However, those practices may increasingly diminish over time in conjunction with the development pace of the socio-political modernity those states fall into. It is also, to some extent, caused by the fact that the modern states have been able to increasingly take over the role of families to provide such necessities in the form of public services<sup>1</sup>. It also means that the modernity level of one state absolutely depends on how far they could go away from such patronage-clientelistic system<sup>2</sup> and how far they can absolutely make a clear distinction between private and state interests<sup>3</sup>. Indonesia today seems to be one of the countries that is still struggling to eradicate the issue of so-called “nepotism”, the political practices based on kinship, within their government and political system mostly performed during Suharto regime.

According to Francis Fukuyama in his book *Political Order and Political Decay*, most of today developed states such as the United States and the United Kingdom instigated their democracy with patronage and clientelism system alike<sup>4</sup>. Prior to arriving at a today modern democratic system which is based on free and fair election, rule of law and democratic accountability, they actually started off their political development with the practices terribly different from those of today modern state standard. Those days, it was a normal practice for the political elites to buy votes probably in the form of either monetary value or just an assurance to provide the constituents with jobs in the government. They also recruited most of the government officials largely from their families and friends rather than those of a merit-based recruitment system. A primitive form of corruption, -the one that is still uncontrollably done in Indonesia today, whereby the government officials either deviated the use of state money for their private interests or use their positions to extract money through unlawful channel or bribery, was still largely practiced.

Moreover, Fukuyama stated that even though those horrendous political practices we find today are being continuously performed in a number of developing countries such as Brazil, Nigeria and Indonesia (which he called “neo-patrimonialism”), it does not mean that, to certain extent, it is due to the idiosyncrasy of those countries. If we take a look at the historical background of the US and UK during the initial phase of their political

---

<sup>1</sup> Harari, Yuval Noah, *Sapiens A Brief History of Human Kind*, London, Penguin Random House UK, 2011, pg.401-402.

<sup>2</sup> Fukuyama, Francis, *Political Order and Political Decay*, London, Profile Books LTD, 2014, pg.10

<sup>3</sup> Ibid, pg 26.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid, pg.135-148.

development during 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> century, patronage and clientelism was used by political elites as an easy way to mass mobilize uneducated voters who knew nothing about how to make use of their fundamental right either for their own benefits or for the society in general through their fledging democratic voting system. Therefore, should those political elites get elected to be congressmen, they might be in return fulfilling their promises by providing their political supporters with non-programmatic offers, which in the long run certainly unfavorable and might be detrimental to the socio-political and economic condition of the society. From that point, Fukuyama opined that those peculiar practices could be likely the inherent part and parcel of the earliest phase of a political evolution in most of democratic countries which is impossible to get rooted out overnight. Before ultimately arriving to a modern and strong democratic state, some countries had to get involved in a terribly hard and long endured struggles to eradicate those corrupted systems which had deeply seated within their society. Their struggles often ended up with bloody conflicts which took a great number of lives. Some of them somehow astonishingly succeeded but some disastrously failed<sup>5</sup>.

There are numerous schools of thoughts expounded by a number of scholars that underline the causal factors leading to the present condition of every state's socio-political and economic development. A number of states successfully arrived at 21<sup>st</sup> century with a remarkable performance in terms of socio-politics and economics development, however some others did the opposites. The performance itself does depends on a variety of factors. Few scholars suggest that it is the climate and the geographical landscape that could be a determinant factor that brings every nation in the world to their present socio-political conditions. Other views suggest that colonialism by European countries throughout Asia, Africa and America is the most likely factor that shaped such development.

Additionally, there is another school of thought that surprisingly states that the formation of strongly consolidated states such as Prussia-Germany, which today become the best economic and political performer in European Union, could be attributed to a number of major wars they experienced. One of which is the war of Jena against Napoleonic Army in 1806, in which they experienced a disastrous defeat largely due to a strategic and tactical ineptitude of the Prussian army. The war had turned the existing Prussia autocracy ridden patrimonial systems upside down and was accordingly replaced by those of inclusive ones. The freedom of land ownership, the removal of social class and of king arbitrary power as well as the introduction of merit-based system for the government officials were continuously introduced and subsequently became the route to the formation of a high-quality autonomous bureaucracy<sup>6</sup>. Germany subsequently seems to be more economically thriving when they shifted their political and economic direction to a mix of strongly nationalist-socialism and democratic system after World War I and World War II.

One of the most interesting contemporary theories on nations' prosperity development has been comprehensively discussed by James A. Robinson and Daren Acemoglu in their book *Why Nations Fail*. They have been successfully able to make an astounding hypothesis which suggests that it is the political dimension that certainly plays an important role in leading one country to whatever economic condition they have lived

---

<sup>5</sup> Ibid, pg.198-213.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid, pg.70-71.

with now. The rich countries are rich because their government know how to make them rich and on the contrary, the poor countries is poor because their government do not know how to make them rich. Those two opposite types of political systems under which the nations are used to live are what they call inclusive versus extractive. In that book, their argument is strongly supported by a number of comparative analysis on the history of one nation's political and economic development to the others. They have been able to explain comprehensively the political path experienced by some economically successful countries under inclusive system compared to those of poor ones under extractive one from the period of ancient empires, colonial era up to the present-day. In his book, they eagerly challenged the world leading scholars' ideas, one of whom is the famous sociologist Jared Diamond, who posited that the economic success of today economically developed nations was largely defined by the ability of them to successfully endure environmental challenges such as major disasters, diseases, hunger, climate change and warfare in the course of their history. Robinson and Acemoglu also strongly disagreed with the notion that the geographical landscape in which people lived in had a great impact on the level of their economic prosperity.

In the beginning of their book, Robinson and Acemoglu has obviously tried to demonstrate the accuracy of the premise that the past political practices performed by the colonial masters to their colonies plays an important role in shaping the present day economic growth and political system of the countries in Americas by showing the evidence of the stark economic disparity of the present day twin city of Nogales, which is located in the US-Mexico border. There are no stark differences between those two twin cities in terms of natural resources, people, climate and geographical landscape. However, nowadays both cities enjoyed quite different prosperity level, whereas the people in Sonora of The US has a level of per-capita income of more than \$ 30,000 compared to the \$ 10,000 that of their friends in Sonora Mexico<sup>7</sup>.

The hypothesis about the source of wealth inequality between North and South America, which can be clearly visible in the twin city of Sonora, on one hand, could be essentially traced back to the relentless implementation of "extractive" political practices that the European colonial power imposed, which was a very viable strategy to conquer the lands and to coerce the indigenous American people into their servitude. The Spanish *conquistadores* who arrived in American continent in 15<sup>th</sup> century initially intended to search for a new world to expand their trade. However, having found generous and vulnerable indigenous people to coercion as well as abundant resources of gold, they eventually got frenzied to colonialize the land, brutally enslaved the populace and built a wealthy empire under their mercantile economic system. Within a short period of time, since the first time Christopher Columbus set foot in Caribbean island in 1492 until the arrival of Herman Cortez, the conqueror of Mexico in 1519, The Spaniards had managed to remarkably take a total control of Caribbean Islands, leading to a brutal enslavement of the inhabitants which caused the number of its indigenous populace to get vanished in a dramatic way. In a period less than two decades, they successfully created the islands as the stepping stone for them to grab the whole new world, which was successfully completed by 1540 after conquering Maya, Inca and Aztec kingdoms to

---

<sup>7</sup> Acemoglu, Daron, & Robinson, James A., *Why Nations Fail: The Origins of Power, Prosperity and Poverty* . 1st ed, New York, Crown, 2012, pg. 7-9.

their causes<sup>8</sup>. The terrible exploitative politics and economic system that had established by the Spaniards for the whole colonial period was not however able to get cut off by the subsequent political elites who took political power upon their independences from the European colonial masters. Since the invasion of Napoleon Army in 1808 which led to the overthrow of Spain king, the colonies in Latin America started to see a chance of forming secessionist movement. A first attempt for an independence was declared by Bolivian people in 1809, even though it was miserably crumpled by the dominant force of Spain army. Since then, the Latin America seems to get entangled into vicious trap of extractive political cycles from one oppressive government to the other one up to present day. Mexico, since 19<sup>th</sup> century, for instance, was economically and politically unstable because they had been repeatedly ruled by a series of extractive leaders with weak governments who recklessly exploited the country, which in return failed to provide better public services for their people<sup>9</sup>.

The opposite story seems to happen in another side of America, the only land which was left for the British empire to colonialize. The colonization of North America by English people was conducted in earnest by 1607 through the establishment of colony settlement funded by Virginia Company, the company which was reminiscent of Dutch East Indies Company (VOC) in now Indonesia, in an area called Jamestown. The initial intention of the colony was not so different from that of Spain colonial desire which were to accumulate riches by exploiting indigenous people and their natural resources to their causes. However, they found that the people and the land they were trying to be exploited was not as favorable as those of the Spaniards encountered in their new land. The land they found there had neither an abundant gold nor silver ore and the people was not easily coerced to their servitude. Since there had been some modest confederated tribesmen in place led by a king of Wahunsunacock, who was also brave enough to reject the colony desire to trade with them because of the king's deep suspicion of the colony's intention, the colonization strategy proved elusive, - the condition that they never thought before. As a result, the terrible starvation during the first year of the winter was unavoidable because they seem unable to get enough food supply either through self-reliant on their own production or through trade with Indian people<sup>10</sup>.

It was under the leadership of John Smith; the colony with a few hundred people could withstand the hardship of the second terrible winter. Smith told them to produce their own food supplies instead of relying on the Indian people's generosity to happily establish a trade with them. Smith realized pretty much that the most likely successful way to colonialize this land could not be done just by an absolute imitation of the strategy equal to that of the Spain implemented in their new world. Nevertheless, according to Smith, the colony needed to depend on their own innovation and creativities to survive and thrive. However, the company thought that they required to do something radically different to improve the colony productivity. Scrambling to get a quick way to reverse the situation after having seen no hope of exploiting the indigenous people, the company under the new ruler upon Smith in turn paradoxically resorted to a strategy by ruthlessly exploiting the colony itself, - a seemingly visceral effort to quickly raise money as the payoff for the company huge loss in funding this annexation project. This ruthless method

---

<sup>8</sup> Ibid, pg. 9-19.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid, pg. 28-32.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid, pg. 19-21.

nonetheless appeared to be a complete failure. Rather than improving the productivity, this new method brought about some problematic issues. Several grieving colony members, due to an obligation to work terribly hard under miserably harsh condition and brutal laws such as a death sentence for those who either run away from the colony or just committed petty crimes, eventually decided to get out of the colony and join the Indian instead. The productivity abruptly dropped much lower than what was expected mainly due to lack of manpower. The colony ruler quickly realized that it would be likely more advantageous for the company if the settlers were provided with incentives such as a greater right of property ownership, much better work and living conditions and better salaries to drive them much more productive. As a result, this unprecedented way of thinking increasingly took precedence and played as a stepping stone for the establishment of earliest inclusive political and economic system within English colonies. Later, it opened up the door to the widespread of socio-political and economic reforms throughout the British colonies in America leading to the deep embodiment of democratic values in the independent United States of America political system accordingly<sup>11</sup>.

From those two different stories, it has been obvious to us that the divergence of critical paths that the European colonial masters went through in Americas by 16<sup>th</sup> century is of profound significance for present day socio-economic differences, one of which is the unequal prosperity level between the present day United States and most of Latin America countries. Evidently, the US is now the country that seems to be able to provide their society with much more favorable or inclusive political and economic conditions rather than the countries in Latin America. The condition that was also likely caused by the existence of a much better political, economic and social stability than that of its neighboring countries of Latin America, which was predated by the earlier formation of democracy leading to a highly functional and centralized government. The highly functional government with highly functional checks and balances system should indeed be able to set up a better taxation system by which the government can collect tax more effectively and use the money to fund the development of relatively better public services such as better education facilities, better healthcare system, better social security, better public transportation systems and better public facilities. So far, it is the United States the country which could likely provide each of its people with "a level playing field" which means that all the people are provided with a much broader opportunity to success with an equal set of rules. Similarly, the US government is also more capable to provide the people with more favorable environment including favorable facilities to develop their skills and abilities, laws and regulations to protect their innovations indiscriminately through a set of fair and strong intellectual and property right institution with much fairer judicial system, as well as the provision of better finance institution systems. All those things are to enable the people to capitalize their innovation in more expedient way. So, it goes without saying that the most successful entrepreneurs in the world such as Thomas Edison, Bill Gates and Steve Jobs whose lucks largely depend on their innovation made good fortunes in the United States, in which all the above provisions are well provided across the board. Were they living in either Mexico or Indonesia, most probably they might have just become rent seeking entrepreneurs casting about political connections to be able to smoothly monopolize such a market. Those are the most

---

<sup>11</sup> Ibid, pg. 19-28.

likely key factors that likely contribute to wealth inequality in places like the above twin city of Sonora and maybe some other places in developing countries as well.

### **The History of Indonesia from Colonial to Modern Time**

Over the last decade, Indonesia has attracted so many economic and political scientists as well as those who have political and economic interests in Indonesia to study its political and economic issues. There are seemingly numerous reasons for it, one of which is the fact that Indonesia is one of politically and economically vibrant countries and potentially plays a significant role in maintaining the stability of the regional and global politics and economy. Secondly, Indonesia is the biggest country in South East Asia in terms of the size of its economy, population, military power, market power, natural resources, land and water territories. Accordingly, due to the nature of globalization, one major economic and political disturbance that happens in Indonesia may likely ignite a domino effect to its vicinity. Similarly, the more prosperous and stable the Indonesia become, the more advantages its neighboring countries could reap from that condition. Thirdly, Indonesia has been prominently known to be one of the relatively peaceful democratic country in the world even though it consists of a large variety of ethnic groups, languages and religions as well as the biggest Muslim population. Indonesia has been always a model of relatively tolerant Muslim country that is able to maintain secular values and been exemplary for all Muslim world on how to address the issue of religious unrest due to extremism and radicalism.

Therefore, to discuss the challenges of Indonesia in becoming a modern stable and prosperous state socially, politically and economically as enshrined in its fundamental principle Pancasila, it would be better to start the discussion by analyzing history of Indonesia from the beginning of colonial era to search for the answer why to some extent Indonesia fails to achieve that utopian dream. The discussion of this case is to utilize an approach almost like that of Robinson and Acemoglu in which the conclusion would be that the current socio-political and economic condition existed in Indonesia is likely the result of a mix of colonial extractive political legacies and exploitative authoritarian regime that happened in a course of Indonesia history.

Long before the establishment of Indonesia as an independent country, the string of tropical islands that the European colonizer called the lands as East Indies, had been ruled by successive European colonizers. Those included Portuguese who first set foot in Malacca in 1511 before they came to capture few Indonesia islands which were famously rich with spices. However, at the end of the day, Portuguese seems to fail to establish a total domination throughout the region due to the lack of military power and the fact that the number of strong centralized kingdoms had existed across the region. Because of those likely underlying factors, they were merely one of the regional players whose most viable strategy in taking advantage of the situation was either to establish alliance with the existing kingdoms to assist them in fighting against other kingdoms, or just to deliberately create a security disturbance in the regional shipping lines crossing around the vicinity of the ports they controlled, just like the other regional powers did. Due to the length of their presence in the region, Portuguese to some extent had essentially brought in a significant impact to the socio-political and economic condition of the region,



most importantly regarding their holy goal in spreading Christianity belief in the eastern part of Indonesia which had been relatively successful<sup>12</sup>.

It was finally the Dutch who later became a major power in Indonesia. They firstly arrived in Indonesia in 1596 and within almost two decades they were able to dominate entirely East Indies territories and expelling the other European competitors to the most outer vicinity of Indonesia. The Dutch success was attributable to their capacity to better finance its expeditionary company Vereenigde Oostindische Compagnie (VOC), which could have their own military and generals, through the creation of a robust joint stock financial institution<sup>13</sup>. The emergence of capitalism in Europe marked by the creation of joint stock companies had allegedly driven the rise of colonialism worldwide and virtually opened the door to a new financial system that enabled investors to countlessly multiply the money they invested in with a relatively lesser risk. This viable strategy, which never crossed the minds of kings or generals of previous times to expand their conquests, had been evidently able to effectively fund the European expedition to colonize the new world. Besides VOC's robust finance support and military supremacy, the lack of unity amongst Indonesia kings and rulers and VOC political strategy of "divide and rule" played a key role on the success of VOC to entirely colonize Indonesia for almost two hundred years<sup>14</sup>. When the company was on the brink of bankruptcy in the light of its managerial failure, the Dutch government took it over and continued to rule Indonesia for the next 150 years, except for Aceh Kingdom that the Dutch was able to completely conquer only in 1913 after thirty years of bloody war<sup>15</sup>.

The way the Dutch ruled Indonesia was reminiscent of the Spain did to her subject in the new world. The ruthlessness of their extractive policy towards Indonesia people brought about despairs, miseries and grievances socially, politically and economically, which was likely similar to those of the indigenous people of Latin America. Thomas Stanford Raffles in his book the History of Java stated that in the beginning of the Dutch occupation, the indigenous people of Java seemed to be friendly, servile and resilient enough and barely create any problem to their colonial master. However, they had increasingly become hostile to the Dutch due to the profound destruction created by them to their lives. This situation has been illustrated really well by Thomas Stanford Raffles in his book the History of Java as follows:

*This frenzy, as a crime against society, seems, if not to have originated under the Dutch, certainly at least to have been increased during their administration by the great severity of their punishment. For the slightest fault, a slave was punished with a severity which he dreaded as much as death. He often to rush on death and vengeance<sup>16</sup>.*

The pursuit of the increasingly greater return of investment by VOC, -which was their only most probable reason to colonialize the East Indies, had in return forced them to

---

<sup>12</sup> Drakeley, Steven, *The History of Indonesia*, Connecticut, Greenwood Press, 2005, pg.24-26.

<sup>13</sup> Ibid, pg.26.

<sup>14</sup> Harari, Yuval Noah, *Sapiens A Brief History of Human Kind*, London, Penguin Random House UK, 2011, pg.355-c360.

<sup>15</sup> Oktorino, Nino, *Perang Terlama Belanda, Kisah Perang Aceh 1873-1913*, Jakarta, PT Elex Media Komputindo, 2018, pg. 106.

<sup>16</sup> Azhar, Drs.Syafrudin, *Thomas Stamford Raffles (1781-1826), Hatinya Tertambat di Tanah Jawa, Pengantar Buku The History of Java Karya Thomas Stamford Raffles*, Yogyakarta, Penerbit Narasi, 2016, pg.xi.

secure those wealth sources in the colonial lands by all means necessary usually through the employment of decisive military forces or the establishment of extractive treaties with local rulers. To have a strong grip on those wealth sources, VOC would therefore need their strong presence as well both in the lands and at the sea of the East Indies and the most potential way to do it was to build a strong military force either to assertively deter their European rivals or to subdue the uncooperative local rulers and people. Indeed, those efforts did not come cheap and all too often they should eventually get fulfilled to detriment of their subjects' livelihood, particularly through the imposition of more oppressive rules, which was a quick way for the Dutch to extract more wealth out of them. One of the most notorious strategies implemented in 1620-1623 by the Dutch was the expulsion and mass killing of the entire indigenous population including the king of Banda islands, a group of small Islands in eastern part of Indonesia famously rich of spices, only to hold a total control on the spice price and production. VOC accordingly replaced the workers to produce the spices of the uninhabited Banda islands with slaves. The Dutch notorious system was subsequently performed and improved in some other areas as well<sup>17</sup>. As a result, a number of kingdoms deliberately choose to cease farming spices and favor an autarky policy in order to get rid of the Dutch brutality. Few of them furthermore choose moved deeply into hinterlands and cease any relations such as trades and alliances with outside world which brought about significant political and economic backwardness<sup>18</sup>.

The transfer of colonial power from VOC to the Dutch government in 1799, after two hundred years of VOC administration, did not immediately end the misery of Indonesia people. By the time the Dutch government restored their power in 1816 after a short interlude which was due to the unification of Dutch Kingdom to France empire and a subsequent power transfer to English East Indies after France disastrous defeat against the United Kingdom, they hastily imposed a draconian economic rule to the people of Indonesia, the rule which was actually the legacy of the former English ruler Thomas Stanford Raffles, called the cultivation system. The system was meant to save the Dutch economy from bankruptcy after losing great amount of money for waging bitter wars against Britain in 1780-84, France Napoleonic Army in 1809-13 and rebellious Belgian Army 1831-32. In theory, the system demanded each village in Java to provide the Dutch government with a portion of free land or a number of free labors for producing export products or cash crops such as sugar, coffee and indigo which was then sold to the Dutch at lower price. This was done by the Dutch to supplant the tax to the government as well as a replacement of the traditional local tribute that they used to give to the local aristocratic rulers in the past. In practice, this system was frequently abused by unscrupulous local rulers, who under the indirect rule system were changed as the agents of the colonial administration and assigned to overlook the tax payment, still quietly forced the people to illegally pay the already abolished traditional tribute, -a certainly illegal practice to which the Dutch ironically turned a blind eye. This extractive system indeed left the already poor people suffered even more that eventually led to the great famine which took place somewhere in the mid of nineteenth century. That severe famine was partially due to the shortage of rice as the people's primary source of food

---

<sup>17</sup> Drakeley, Steven, *The History of Indonesia*, Connecticut, Greenwood Press, 2005, pg.28-30.

<sup>18</sup> Acemoglu, Daron, & Robinson, James A., *Why Nations Fail: The Origins of Power, Prosperity and Poverty*. 1st ed, New York, Crown, 2012, pg. 247-250.

whose production had been largely replaced by those of export crops. The rampant extortion and tax manipulation conducted by the local rulers to the farmers also played an important role in starving the people due to the shortage of cash for buying rice. On the contrary, this extractive system generated an abundant profit for the Dutch by which the Dutch government could adequately finance the development of the country railway system and paid off the mountainous amount of the government as well as debt left by the VOC bankruptcy<sup>19</sup>.

The severe miseries suffered by the natives to a certain extent had attracted a number of Dutch human right activists' sympathetic attentions. One of the well-known Dutch activists named Eduard Douwes Dekker or Multatuli, in his famous book *Max Havelaar*, wrote a brilliant story so effective to voice the miseries of the native people that had generated concerns of Netherland people about the cruelty of their government in their colonial lands. On top of that, Piet Brooshooft report in his newspaper *the Locomotive* about the poor condition of the native people ultimately played a significant role in calling the Queen's attention. Accordingly, she planned an improvement on the social and economic lives of her subjects which resulted in the establishment of the Ethical Policy in 1901. To a certain extent, the policy did improve the socio-economy of the East Indies due to the improvement in areas of economy, education and welfare system and had showed some economic benefits such as the increase of international trade of the East Indies commodities, the increase of investment in infrastructures as well as the influx of foreign multinational companies to country. As a demand of a greater political autonomy for the native was strongly claimed by the supporters of this policy, it also made the Dutch government obligated to prepare the native to have a capability in governing their own country by giving them some opportunities to work in low clerical jobs in private companies or government offices, despite the fact that the government had half-heartedly showed their willingness in providing the natives with a full political independence in a near future<sup>20</sup>. Under that policy, it did not however bring a substantial modernization on the life of the natives as well as improvement in curbing economic inequalities especially between the natives and some other minor ethnic groups such as Arab, Chinese and more importantly the significant socio-political gap between the natives and the Dutch per se. By the end of the day, it was found that the policy was likely not wholeheartedly performed and the natives were seemingly still left to rife exploitation and still worse off in terms of economic prosperity and politics. The economic gap can be clearly seen by the significant income inequality in the end of the ethic policy in 1930 between the natives with the per-capita income of 59,70 Gulden, Chinese 326,90 Gulden and the European 2.700,00 Gulden<sup>21</sup>.

The increased connection with outside world, as one of the benefits gained from the ethical policy, had gradually raised a sense of identity awareness among the natives who were particularly forged by some young nationalists having an exposure to western education. They established some political movements which were commonly based on different political and ethnical backgrounds. Several of which were inclined towards

---

<sup>19</sup> Drakeley, Steven, *The History of Indonesia*, Connecticut, Greenwood Press, 2005, pg.34-42.

<sup>20</sup> Vickers, Adrian, *A History of Modern Indonesia, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition*, New York, Cambridge University Press, 2013, pg.18-20.

<sup>21</sup> Prof.Dr. Boediono, *Ekonomi Indonesia Dalam Lintasan Sejarah*, Bandung, Mizan, 2016, pg. 58.

Islamic values while the other ones were drawn toward Marxism and Nationalism<sup>22</sup>. These movements ultimately coalesced into a larger one to create an idea on the formation of a politically independent nation which was based one language, one nation and one land called Indonesia and was formally declared by them in a Youth Congress meeting held in Batavia in October 28<sup>th</sup>, 1928. The introduction of Indonesian as a national language played a key role in forming a national identity of Indonesia. In addition to that, the combination of embracing Indonesian language and the introduction of an inclusive idea to unite various ethnicities into one single political entity within this movement was considered able to successfully sideline some other political propensities in place and a sound strategy to circumvent the Dutch cunning way of “divide and rule” in order to gain an independence later on<sup>23</sup>.

Shortly after the victory of Japanese Army over the Dutch in East Indies, Japanese empire managed to take over all the lands from the Dutch. Their arrival to East Indies which were initially greeted by the Indonesia people as their liberators from the Dutch imperialism proved to be totally delusional. Instead of liberating Indonesia from the Dutch and made the independence coming into reality, the Japanese, despite of their short tenure in occupying Indonesia, turned to be another destructive power that occupied to create more destruction and miseries to the people of Indonesia. Since their brutal Army simply wanted to get all the resources they could found in Indonesia to be funneled to wage all-out war in an attempt to expand the territory of their empire. Thousands of Indonesia died of starving or harsh force labor during the four years of their occupation from 1942 -1945. However, the Japanese left a few worthwhile legacies upon their departure such as the creation of strong nationalism ideology of Indonesian and a number of well-trained groups of militias. All of them were of paramount importance in preparing the newly independent nation to defend their selves against the next Dutch military invasion<sup>24</sup>.

By the end of World War II, the defeat of Japanese army by the allied power in South Asia opened the door for the people of Indonesia to get their ultimate dream coming into being which was a total political independence from all the foreign power. Eventually, they formally vowed their independence by August 17<sup>th</sup>, 1945 with Pancasila as their guiding principles, the five pillars which was declared by the Indonesia founding father and the Indonesia first president, Sukarno, few months before that important event.

Sukarno was arguably an astute politician and a charismatic nationalist who was best known for his political acumen in domesticating three contradictory mainstream political ideologies which were Nationalist, Islamist and Marxist. From the beginning of his political career, he had been influenced by an idea of combining various mainstream political groups into one single political entity as the most possible way to materialize the Indonesia independence. Fukuyama argued that his brave political effort to combine those sharply contradicted political groups in the absence of an authoritarian regime was virtually ambiguous and to become the source of his disastrous political failure<sup>25</sup>. It could be seen from the president Sukarno’s incompetence to fairly manage the ideological

---

<sup>22</sup> Drakeley, Steven, *The History of Indonesia*, Connecticut, Greenwood Press, 2005, pg.64-65.

<sup>23</sup> Fukuyama, Francis, *Political Order and Political Decay*, London, Profile Books LTD, 2014, pg.325-326.

<sup>24</sup> Vickers, Adrian, *A History of Modern Indonesia, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition*, New York, Cambridge University Press, 2013, pg.87-88.

<sup>25</sup> Fukuyama, Francis, *Political Order and Political Decay*, London, Profile Books LTD, 2014, pg.326-327

differences amongst political parties in peaceful manner including the managerial failure of Indonesia economic development as well as the failure of his treatment for the international relations of Indonesia with some other neighbor countries consequently led to a more complicated national political turbulence. Furthermore, the political enmity amongst the parties which was predominantly brought about by a bitter conflict between the nationalists in the Indonesia Army and communists in *Partai Komunis Indonesia* (PKI) was ultimately ensued by the PKI coup trial which was at the beginning preceded by the brutal assassination of seven Indonesia Army generals by PKI members<sup>26</sup>. The barbaric event which Sukarno thought as a tiny incident in a huge revolution eventually brought his presidency and political career to a bitter end.

Since independence, Indonesia Army had become one of the political powers that played a significant role in Indonesia political sphere of influence. Their involvement in politics was originally brought about by the ineptitude of the nascent Indonesian government to strongly rule a number of irregular military factions throughout the nation after the independence. They were formerly created and trained by the Japanese army and after being dispersed, they established a number of independent military units. Because the government was too weak to unite and sustain them to be one regular standing national army under one centralized command which complied to the central government policy, they consequently tended to be self-regulated, self-sustained and several of which even opted to have a political inclination towards a political party instead of the government. It was a common thing that they disobeyed orders from the higher level of command even the orders from the central government itself. They even required to search for their own financial resources to self-sustain their organization. It is no surprising that some officers had to have a dual role to get their operational and logistical ends met, -one side as army officers, the other one as entrepreneurs<sup>27</sup>. However, those bizarre circumstances seemed not to last only after the end of revolution, it was unfortunately carried over as one of the political practices during Suharto regime.

Based on some reliable accounts, Suharto ascension to presidency was likely brought about by his ability to cleverly play out his military position during the chaotic political situation after the failed PKI coup d'état on September 30<sup>th</sup>, 1965. He then managed to legitimately seize a mandate on March 11, 1966 from Sukarno to do whatever necessary to restore law and order while using that chance to push Sukarno to relinquish his power to him in 1967, one and half year after the PKI failed coup<sup>28</sup>.

Upon securing that mandate, Suharto with the full back-up from Indonesia Army had pledged to restore the politically and economically devastated Indonesia to a better condition including the full restoration of severed relation with the neighbor countries due to impact of military operation against Malaysia during Sukarno administration. The mandate that he obtained from Sukarno was basically expected by most of civilian political elites to be voluntarily handed over to them immediately once the Indonesia army had successfully restored law and order and brought the Indonesia politics and economy to a better condition as most of Indonesia people desperately desired. However, the democratic civil society those elites expected was never returned to their hands once Suharto regrettably closed the door of the opportunity and chose an undemocratic political

---

<sup>26</sup> Drakeley, Steven, *The History of Indonesia*, Connecticut, Greenwood Press, 2005, pg.106-112.

<sup>27</sup> Drakeley, Steven, *The History of Indonesia*, Connecticut, Greenwood Press, 2005, pg.87-88.

<sup>28</sup> Ibid, pg.114-116.

path instead. That path was likely reminiscent of the one that the former colonial master practiced in sustaining their power, such as arbitrarily crushing his political opponents and those who were most likely posed a threat to his power bitterly. In order to keep his power maintained and to outperform his political opponents, he then created one competing political party, which was named functional party or *Golongan Karya (Golkar)*, whose members was to include all civil servants and government officials. This thereby made Golkar as a solely mighty political party against which no one seems dare to challenge. To add insult to injury of Indonesia democracy, Suharto, with the full assistance of Indonesia Army, oppressively limited the number of political parties, and eventually they forcibly merged into two new parties with two different political backgrounds which were nationalist (*Partai Demokrasi Indonesia*) and Islamist (*Partai Persatuan Pembangunan*)<sup>29</sup>.

### **The Challenges to Modern Democracy of Indonesia since Suharto**

Indonesia seemingly experienced a dramatic change in its political development shortly after the downfall of Suharto regime in 1998 which everyone could hardly foresee it to take place in that short period of time beforehand. Despite at the expense of thousands of Indonesia people killed during the riots, each of Indonesia people however must have brought a great feeling of happiness with the hope that the freedom they had just seized would bring about more prosperity to their life in a foreseeable future. They strongly demanded a “reformation” in which the government could make corrective actions in every aspects of the people lives for their betterment, including the demand of addressing the issues on corruption, collusion and nepotism (KKN) as well as the full recognition of every people economic and political rights by the succeeding government. They also demanded that from that point onwards the government should be no longer acting arbitrarily as if they were a king who could exploit the people as their slaves, but the government was supposed to be the one whom the people could entirely depend their lives on. To make those things happened, the government was to be acting responsibly as the agent solely under the principal outright will and control who was the people per se.

However, after twenty years since the downfall of Suharto, the democracy that was initially expected to bring prosperities and justices to the whole people of Indonesia seems to be still far beyond their expectation even until today. It certainly casts doubt on whether the democracy they have chosen is the correct political recipe for having their dream come true, or should they choose the other way around to let another authoritarian regime like Suharto to rule them again like it was before? It must be a complex circumstance that no political elite could provide an easy answer for addressing it.

Democratic political system, which is nowadays still increasingly becoming a likely better political choice, had gained its prominence by the end of cold war when it somehow being largely embraced by most former communist countries in Eastern Europe and newly independent countries of former Soviet Union after the end of the cold war. It seems that it re-gained its prominent once again in the middle east countries after the Arab revolution or the so-called Arab Springs occurred. However, some argued that that event did not actually drive the middle east countries to experience a true liberal

---

<sup>29</sup> Ibid, pg.116-119

democracy, given the fact that some of them have finally ended up getting stuck with the issues of the widespread of religious radicalism and bloody civil wars<sup>30</sup>.

Indonesia transition to democracy seems to be categorized as “third wave of democracy” and was most probably caused by what Fukuyama stated “contagion, imitation and the failures of incumbent authoritarian regime”<sup>31</sup>. In this sense, Indonesia is still in the early phase of its democracy which is still struggling to consolidate it. In other word, Indonesia democracy is still faraway to reach a level of maturity similar to the one of some other matured democratic countries such as the European countries or the US. They are still casting about a niche form of democracy that could fit into the Indonesia highest level of socio-political equilibrium.

A stable democracy could essentially come about commensurate with the increasing number of middle-class societies which demand a greater political rights and better public services from their government. They strongly feel that democracy is a good political venue to make their demand fulfilled and make them more economically and politically better-off. According to Fukuyama, the number of middle-class people with higher education does have a big impact on the stability of democracy itself<sup>32</sup>. As such, democracy by third world countries with relatively low level of middle-class people like those in Indonesia do not necessarily brings them immediately to the formation of a stable one. On the contrary, middle class people in those countries could be going against democracy if they find that democracy on the other hand could obstructs their interests. In Indonesia it could be likely true that its middle-class people, equipped with a relatively greater number of the means of production, could be going against a democratically economic system in order to be easily collude with the autonomous local governments, to create an oligarchy for extracting the country resources for their own benefit. This is the most probable reason why the inequality in Indonesia is so rampant as indicated by one credible survey that 45 percent of national wealth has been dominated by only one percent of the wealthiest people of Indonesia<sup>33</sup>.

On top of that, as the feeling of pride and complacency shared amongst Indonesian for the amazing diversities and the richness that the country possesses, has made anyone of them proudly boasted that their country has been enormously endowed with the richness of cultures, ethnics and religious diversities and abundant natural resources. However, besides the tremendous natural gifts they possess, lurking insidiously the political vulnerabilities that may ignite chaos and disintegration in a very short possible time should their leaders are pretty late to be aware of it. It had been actually well understood by the Indonesia visionary founding father. In order to maintain the unity of its diversity, the former strong and charismatic leaders such as Sukarno had quite obsessed with the implementation of his political manifesto in order to keep the unity of the country against any kind of external socio-political disturbances that could lead to disintegration. Anyone who may become a leader of Indonesia today or in the future seems to be the one who must be able to ingeniously implement such an idealism in his political agenda should they want to be successful in leading Indonesia as a whole. At the same time, they must have a sound strategy to be able to deal with the bitterness of

---

<sup>30</sup> Fukuyama, Francis, *Political Order and Political Decay*, London, Profile Books LTD, 2014, pg. 474.

<sup>31</sup> Ibid, pg. 474.

<sup>32</sup> Ibid., pg. 470.

<sup>33</sup> Budimanta, Arif, *Mengikis Oligarki Ekonomi*, Jakarta, Koran Kompas dated March 1, 2018, pg.2

the inherent political realities of Indonesia that would still continuously come up every now and then, such as the raise of religious fundamentalism, the raise of political identity, the negative impact of power decentralization to local government, rebellious movement in some areas, ethno-communal conflicts, etc. To some extent, Sukarno essentially had been able to make use of his secular political strategy of uniting different ideologies of Nasakom in peaceful manner and of employing it as a powerful force to gain independence from the colonial master. Nevertheless, in the end, he disastrously failed to make use of that strategy to stay in power due to his failure in handling the political rivalries between nationalist and communist. Suharto then managed to come to power for almost 32 years due to his ability to silence the democracy through an effective implementation of his iron fist strategy to cope with those mentioned vulnerabilities, even though he eventually got overthrown by the power of the people due to his failure to deal with the bitter financial crisis in 1998.



This figure shows us that the Indonesia people pride themselves mostly on the diversity of their country.  
Source: Hasil Jajak Pendapat Kompas hari Senin tanggal 20 Agustus 2018.



The Indonesian formidable strength to hold its unity was predicted to start to lose its durability and might have gotten disintegrated into several small states or so-called Balkanization dilemma soon after the collapse of Suharto regime. At the same time, some national political experts were also predicted that Indonesia would have been ended up to be a failed state due to the inability of the government to function properly. However, the remarkable resilience that Indonesia could show to the international community on the contrary debunked all those predictions. In the past fifteen years, the existence of Indonesia as a nation state is remarkably unquestioned. Indonesia could perform well enough (*cukup baik*) in terms its economy growth although some doubts have been casted upon on its sustainability. Indonesia could perform well internationally which is still proved by its ability to join G20 members, a group of some countries which represents the twenty countries with the biggest economy in the world. It is predicted that Indonesia would join upper middle income country by 2025. Democracy could moderately run in a smooth manner marked by the considerable achievement in the direct president election, including the direct election for local leaders by the people. It was generally able to be conducted in a miraculously peaceful manner, except in a few districts of Papua province in which Indonesia government seems to suffer a severe incapacity in exerting its strong authority to restrain some Papuan native people who are tribal in nature, and are residing in a large area with extreme terrains, as well as who are living along thousand kilometers of an open land border. This condition in general indeed invalidated some predictions of Indonesia as a potentially failed state in which its general elections throughout the country had a possibility to happen chaotically and violently.

The fledgling democracy of Indonesia upon Suharto era is also threatened by the raise of religious fundamentalism which was used to be ruthlessly silenced when Suharto was still in power. It seemingly came back to the surface, gradually started gaining ground and got their desirable involvement in Indonesia mainstream politics with a huge number of sympathizers. Some of whom took positions as leading political elites in some religious based parties or civil organizations. Few of them however doggedly chose a radically destructive way in reaching their end goal through the wanton acts of destruction and terrorism to spread fears either to the society at large or to the government apparatus. Basically, their most fundamental aim is to create their own state (Khilafah) based on Islamic law Sariah which is politically independent from the Indonesia state. It must indeed go against the most un-negotiated principle of Indonesia as a state which is the unitary state of Republic of Indonesia itself. Since their political aims are frequently in conflict with the liberal democratic values which separate the state and the religion, oftentimes it makes even more problematic for the democracy of Indonesia. The obvious instance is the case of Jakarta governor election last year which did challenged the fundamental principle of unity in diversity as well as the notion that in Indonesia democracy does fits and can coexist with Islamic values. This event also likely marks the Indonesia democracy with the emergence of political identity which favors the leaders based on races, religions and groups (SARA) instead of their programmatic agendas.

As Indonesia arguably become an important part of the globalized world, in which political and economic interconnectedness amongst countries is increasingly unavoidable, and it may become a gigantic unstoppable power that could sweep away any political and economic barriers between states. To be better off in international arena, Indonesia indeed should actively take initiatives to make itself ready in dealing with the

negative impact of that circumstance. A number of liberal economic agencies have kept suggesting that would one country wish to economically keep abreast with its neighbors, they may need to simply take off their sense of overrated self-reliance, exclusiveness and protectionism thinking, get on the bandwagon of free trade and take a full use of its comparative advantage to benefit from the global economy. Adam Smith, the father of free trade, stated in his book "The Wealth of Nations" that even the least productive country may be still prosperous if it implements an inclusive economic system. Under its exclusive system such a blindly implemented protectionism, the liberal economists think that one country may be left far behind in many respects.

Today, most of the prosperous countries in the world are the ones which strongly advocate the virtues of democracy, globalization, free trade, rule of law, equality, justice, open market, intellectual and human right protection and inclusive growth. However, based on the severe economic calamities in a number of countries with liberal economic system in 2008 and the threat of non-state actors based on religious radicalism (the raise of Islamic State (IS)) in several middle countries which wreak havoc their security and sovereignty, it would be wise to say that even though Indonesia has chosen a liberal democratic system in terms of its politics and economy as their ways of lives, it should not necessarily mean that the government should hunker down and limit its involvement and its interference on the political and economic activities on which Indonesia integrity and people livelihood and security are at stake. There is supposed to be a time when the government could involve more on both national politics and economics should they see that those matters could likely jeopardize the credibility and integrity of the state to a great extent.

## **Conclusion**

Most of the nation states in this world generally shared unique historical backgrounds. In most cases, they were the product of a constant exposure to the influence of the dynamics in the global course of events, before they were well established to be stable and solid nation states. Whatever the historical backgrounds that a nation has endured, to some degree it may become an essential stepping stone for us to understand the reason why that particular nation arrives to the present-day condition. Prior to the formation of as a nation state, Indonesia was a colony of the Dutch empire well known as the East Indies. The native people of the East Indies was used to be ruthlessly treated and racially abused for hundred years under the brutal Dutch company (VOC) for one hundred fifty years before it was taken over by the Dutch Government for two hundred years after the collapse of VOC. The Dutch government provided them neither with rights nor freedom and never prepare them well enough to develop their own modern political and economic institutions once the time came for them to form their own independent nation state. However, there were some nationalists who were audacious enough to instigate a movement to form a unitary state of Indonesia, one of them was a charismatic one, Sukarno, who introduced *Nasakom* ideology to his followers.

Sukarno with his political ideology was able to bring Indonesia to be an independent nation. However, once the independence could be gained, he failed to create a political stability in the democracy of Indonesia which was at that moment subject to a strongly competitive multi political party system. In the end, he was succumbed to the chaotically political instability created by the great rivalries of the major opposing groups which

seems to be unescapable due to the absence of a strongly authoritarian regime. Suharto then come to power and took a total control on Indonesia political system which directly silenced Indonesia democratic system for the benefit of their friends and families. Suharto, in the end, was overthrown due to the 1998 financial crisis. Since then Indonesia seems to get entangled into the spiral of the democratic dysfunction and neo-patrimonialism which hampered the demand of the people of Indonesia at large to get their livelihood in every aspect much better than before. To some extent, this might be politically due to the impact of long extractive system during the colonization era which is ensued by the extractive Suharto regime whose repercussion is still unfavorably prevailing in today modern Indonesian political systems.

As Indonesia today has been to some extent politically and economically living in a democratic environment which to some degree provide its people with more rights and freedom to make every aspect of their lives better-off than before. Today, the people of Indonesia could have a greater right to select the best leaders they entrust to lead their country to a better future. Not just like in the past, the Indonesian people now should not be worried to be harshly browbeaten by their government should they criticize the latter for failing to provide the Indonesia people with better public services that the people are supposed to obtain. To some extent, Indonesia people may be feeling safe enough to do their business, without any fears that a powerful entity could arbitrarily steal their business profit.

However, the current favorable democratic condition seems one thing that the Indonesian are not to be taken for granted. There are a number of challenges and vulnerabilities, that Indonesia should be continuously aware of, to the solidity of Indonesia as a huge democratic nation state, since the current democracy is still too immature to generate a modern, strong and stable democratic state system which could be utilized to deal with those challenges. In other word, Indonesia is currently still in a condition as what Fukuyama categorizes “low level equilibrium” whereby the government is to some degree dysfunctional in running its businesses, which is typically marked by a widespread distrust between the government and the people. It is partly shown by the reluctance of the latter to willingly obey rules and regulations imposed by the government. In this situation, the society must be strongly coerced accordingly to get them comply with the rules and regulations<sup>34</sup>.

However, those challenges indeed should be able to be wisely addressed, one of which is by creating better political institutions with a better leadership to create a high trust between the Government and the people leading to a high level equilibrium of its democratic and government system. It certainly needs a hard work, a good cooperation among associated stakeholders and will definitely take decades to achieve it. As what French President Charles de Gaulle stated “A great leader emerges from the encounter of will and an exceptional period in history”, one might think that Indonesia is most likely heading towards that direction, just waiting for the right moment for a radically brilliant reformist to emerge within a right point in time whose leadership is fully supported by all

---

<sup>34</sup> Fukuyama, Francis, *Political Order and Political Decay*, London, Profile Books LTD, 2014, pg. 522.

level of society. It commonly comes up in countries which experience a kind of huge shock due to a political or economic crisis which demands that reformist to lead them<sup>35</sup>.

### **Bibliography**

Abdurrazaq, Sulaisi & Abdurrazaq, Hadiri, *Membaca Ulang Demokrasi Kita*, Pamekasan, CV. Duta Media, 2017.

Acemoglu, Daron, & Robinson, James A., *Why Nations Fail: The Origins of Power, Prosperity and Poverty*. 1st ed, New York, Crown, 2012.

Budimanta, Arif, *Mengikis Oligarki Ekonomi*, Jakarta, Koran Kompas dated March 1, 2018

Diamond, Jared, *Collapse, How Societies Choose to Fail or Succeed*, New York, Penguin Books, 2011.

Drakeley, Steven, *The History of Indonesia*, Connecticut, Greenwood Press, 2005

Fukuyama, Francis, *The Origins of Political Order, From Pre-human Times to the French Revolution*, London, Profile Books LTD, 2012.

Fukuyama, Francis, *Political Order and Political Decay*, London, Profile Books LTD, 2014

Fukuyama, Francis, *The End of History and The Last Man*, New York, Free Press, 2006.

Harari, Yuval Noah, *Sapiens A Brief History of Human Kind*, London, Penguin Random House UK, 2011

Hunter, Hellen Louise, *Sukarno and The Indonesia Coup, Untold Story*, London, Praeger Security International, 2007.

Oktorino, Nino, *Perang Terlama Belanda, Kisah Perang Aceh 1873-1913*, Jakarta, PT Elex Media Komputindo, 2018

Prof.Dr. Boediono, *Ekonomi Indonesia Dalam Lintasan Sejarah*, Bandung, Mizan, 2016

---

<sup>35</sup> Sharma, Ruchir, *The Rise and Fall of Nations, Forces of Change in Post-Crisis World*, New York, W.W Norton & Company, 2017.pg. 64.

Sharma, Ruchir, *The Rise and Fall of Nations, Forces of Change in Post-Crisis World*, New York, W.W Norton & Company, 2017.

Stamford Raffles, Thomas, *The History of Java*, Yogyakarta, Penerbit Narasi, 2016

Ash Centre for Democratic Governance and Innovation, *The Sum is Greater Than the Parts, Doubling Shared Prosperity in Indonesia Through Local and Global Integration*, Jakarta, PT Gramedia Pustaka Utama, 2013.

Vickers, Adrian, *A History of Modern Indonesia, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition*, New York, Cambridge University Press, 2013